Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

I.   Objection to the Drawings.

In the Office action dated February 15, 2005 ("Office action"), the Examiner objects to Figure 3 as being too large, leading to a cut-off of the drawing. The Applicant notes that Figure 3 as filed includes an open-ended box for the external network 360. Judging from Figure 3 in the published patent application, no part of Figure 3 as filed has been cut off. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, the Applicant submits herewith a replacement sheet of drawings for Figure 3, in which the entire Figure, except for the title, has been shifted downward.

II.   Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2.

In the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5 as being indefinite and unclear. Specifically, the Examiner objects that claim 1 is directed to both an apparatus and a method. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, but has removed the language "In an apparatus" from claim 1 to expedite prosecution. The Applicant has amended claim 3 for the sake of consistency and canceled claim 5 without prejudice.

In the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 11-28 as being indefinite and unclear. Specifically, the Examiner objects that claims 11, 14, 17 and 23 "claim both an apparatus/computer-readable medium along with a method." The Applicant respectfully disagrees, but has rewritten claims 11-28 as method claims to expedite prosecution.

In the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 6-10 as being indefinite and unclear. Specifically, the Examiner objects that claim 6 is directed to both a network node and a method. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, but has removed the language "In a network node" from claim 6 to expedite prosecution. The Applicant has amended claim 8 for the sake of consistency and canceled claim 10 without prejudice.

In the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 21 and 26 for including the phrase "a PCF of a P-CSCF," which the Examiner deems indefinite and unclear. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, but has replaced the phrase "a PCF of a P-CSCF" with the phrase "a P-

CSCF/PCF" in claims 21 and 26. The phrase "P-CSCF/PCF" appears in original claims 3 and 8 as well as throughout the application as filed.

III.   Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(e).

In the Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-28 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0120749 to Widegren et al. ("Widegren publication"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant submits herewith a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132. The non-provisional application published as the Widegren publication (and its 11 parent provisional applications) describe a variety of features. For some of the subject matter described in the Widegren publication/non-provisional, and for some of the subject matter described in its parent provisional application filed March 6, 2001, the Applicants listed on the Widegren publication derived their knowledge of the subject matter from Hugh Shieh, the inventor for the present application. For such subject matter, the Widegren publication should not be cited as a § 102(e) reference against the claims of the present application.

Below, the Applicant also addresses other subject matter described in the Widegren publication/non-provisional and one or more of its parent provisional applications.

A.   The Widegren Publication as a § 102(e) Reference.

The Widegren publication is a published version of a non-provisional application filed November 5, 2001. The non-provisional application claims the benefit of 11 provisional applications.

In general, the effective date of the Widegren publication as a § 102(e) reference depends on when the subject matter used in a rejection was supported (under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1) in the non-provisional and provisional applications. (*See* MPEP 2136.03.III.) For example, if certain subject matter is supported for the first time in the non-provisional application, the § 102(e) reference date of the Widegren publication for that subject matter is November 5, 2001.

In addition, if the Widegren publication describes subject matter that the Widegren Applicants derived from Hugh Shieh, such subject matter should not be cited in a § 102(e) rejection against the claims of the present application. (*See* MPEP 715.01(c) and 716.10.)

B.   The Derived Subject Matter Should Not Be Cited to Reject the Pending Claims of the Present Application.

The Widegren parent provisional application filed March 6, 2001, describes a "Method 2" in which:

> The media authorization token is extended to be composed of two parts. The first part is a base token that is generated an added to the SIP signaling as in the existing model. The SIP user agent in the mobile and the SIP proxy server in the network then generate a media stream identifier extension for each media stream according to a defined algorithm. The final token used for the bearer is then the combination of the base token with the media stream identifier extension.
>
> ...
>
> A complete token is generated by using a base token, along with an extension to explicitly identify the individual stream. The base token is generated and distributed with the SIP signaling using the existing mechanism. The SIP user agent in the mobile terminal and the SIP proxy server in the network both generate a media stream identifier extension using a well defined algorithm. This well defined algorithm ensures that both entities shall generate the same identifier for the same stream. The complete token is then the combination of the base token and the media stream identifier extension.

(March 6 provisional, pages 2 and 3.)

In the attached Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, statements 9.a and 9.b relate to subject matter described as part of "Method 2" in the March 6 provisional. As stated in the Declaration, the Applicants listed on the March 6 provisional derived their knowledge of the subject matter of statements 9.a and 9.b ("derived subject matter") from Hugh Shieh. To the extent the Widegren publication (e.g., in a paragraph cited by the Examiner in the Office action) includes description of the derived subject matter, the Widegren Applicants derived their knowledge of such subject matter from Hugh Shieh.

The derived subject matter of the Widegren publication should not be cited in a § 102(e) rejection against the claims of the present application. (*See* MPEP 715.01(c) and 716.10.)

C.   Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-28 and Other Subject Matter of the Widegren Publication (and Parent Provisionals).

The Applicant notes that the March 6 provisional application also describes, for example, a "Method 1" in which a "Media-Authorization token is to be included in the SDP" such that

"each media will explicitly carry the token authorized for it." (March 6 provisional, pages 2 and 3.)

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-28 are allowable over the Widegren publication for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, "transmitting a PDP context request including binding information for one or more IP media flows of a session, wherein the binding information includes an authorization token and one or more IP media flow identifiers." According to claim 1, a PDP context request includes binding information, and the binding information includes an authorization token and one or more IP media flow identifiers.

Claim 6, as amended, recites, "receiving binding information for one or more IP media flows of a session, wherein the binding information includes an authorization token and one or more IP media flow identifiers." According to claim 6, an entity such as a network node receives binding information for one or more IP media flows of a session. The binding information includes an authorization token and one or more IP media flow identifiers. The entity processes the binding information, interpreting each of the IP media flow identifier(s) relative to the authorization token.

Claim 11, as amended, recites, "transmitting a context activation request including the media authorization token and plural media flow identifiers for authorizing each of plural media flows of a session."

Claim 14, as amended, recites, "receiving a context request including a media authorization token and plural media flow identifiers for authorizing each of plural media flows of a session."

Claim 17, as amended, recites, "transmitting a message including binding information for authorizing one or more packet media flows of a session, wherein the binding information includes the authorization token and one or more packet media flow identifiers."

Claim 23, as amended, recites, "receiving a message including binding information for authorizing one or more packet media flows of a session, wherein the binding information includes the authorization token and one or more packet media flow identifiers."

The filing date of the present application is March 4, 2002, and the present application claims the benefit of Provisional Application No. 60/248,358, filed April 17, 2001. The Applicant believes the pending claims to be entitled to an effective filing date of April 17, 2001.

As noted above, the effective date of the Widegren publication as a § 102(e) reference depends on when the subject matter used in a rejection was supported (under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1) in the non-provisional and provisional applications. (*See* MPEP 2136.03.III.) The Applicant notes that the March 6 provisional application describes a "Method 1" in which a "Media-Authorization token is to be included in the SDP" such that "each media will explicitly carry the token authorized for it." (March 6 provisional, pages 2 and 3.) The Applicant's April 17 provisional application mentioned a similar mechanism:

> The IETF SIP WG has discussed the possibility of including an authorization token per media flow in the Session Description Protocol, which could then be provided by the UE to the GGSN as binding information. This approach is architecturally correct, but requires changing SDP and sending more bits over the air.

(April 17 provisional, page 1; *see also* present application, page 14, lines 3-6.)

Using an authorization token per media stream (as in Method 1 of the March 6 provisional) is different than and leads away from the above-cited "flow identifier" language of claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 17 and 23, respectively.

Claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 17 and 23 are allowable. In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicant will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18-22 and 24-28.

IV.   Claims 29-32.

The Applicant has added claims 29-32, which the Applicant believes to be supported by the provisional application filed April 17, 2001.

V.   Conclusion.

Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-32 should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

VI.   Request for Interview.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the application to be allowable. If any issues remain, however, the Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (503) 226-7391 prior to issuance of the next communication in order to arrange a telephonic interview. This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By   _____
Kyle B. Rinehart
Registration No. 47,027

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet replaces original sheet 3 of the drawings. Applicant has provided the attached replacement sheet without a marked-up copy, since the only change to the drawing has been to shift downward the entire Figure except the title.

Attachment: Replacement sheet 3.